

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE CENTRAL PLANNING BOARD
OF THE CITY OF NEWARK

In the matter of the Public Hearing :
to determine whether the area to be :
set aside as the site for the :
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE AND DENTISTRY :
is a blighted area within the mean- :
ing of the Statute. :

. :

WRITTEN STATEMENTS SENT TO THE
CENTRAL PLANNING BOARD WITHIN THE PERIOD
BEGINNING WITH THE TERMINATION DATE OF THE
PUBLIC HEARING HELD ON JUNE 29TH, 1967, AND
ENDING ON JULY 10TH, 1967.

BOOK No. 9.

Central Planning Board

157 Fairmount Ave

City Hall

Newark, N. J.

Newark, N. J.

July 6, 1967

Dear Sir:

I attended several meetings of the "Blight Hearings" for the area for the Medical College and although my name was on the list I never had a chance to express my opinion.

I feel that the proposed land allowed for this college is far too much when the housing situation is as acute as it is. If the houses are so terrible, they should be torn down but replaced with other (low-rise) houses.

Of course there is a great lack of medical facilities in Newark, which is why they never should have moved St. Barnabas out. This land is still unoccupied so why not build the Med school there? Or in Branch Brook Park....or Weequahic Park of in the Meadowlands. There is plenty of other land besides this that would displace so many people.

There have been NO provisions made for these people who would have to move. At my age, I doubt that I could get a new mortgage. You failed to make the landlords keep up their property so naturally

1 it would become run down. This could be corrected
2 very easily.

3 So, Planning Board, with these thoughts
4 in mind, I'm asking you to please consider the
5 plight of these residents when making your
6 decision.

7 Yours truly

8 /s/ Rufus Jackson

9 RUFUS JACKSON

10
11
12 Landlord

13 80 Wallace Street

14 Newark 3, New Jersey

15 July 7, 1967

16 Secretary & Chairman of the Planning Board
17 The Medical School of Medicine & Dentistry.

18 Dear Sir:

19 I am speaking to the Planning Board &
20 protestors for myself. Since I hav'nt given any
21 group to speak for me. I don't know of any law
22 that prevents a property owner from selling his
23 property to any person or organization, so long as
24 it is used for a legitimate or respectable purpose.

25 There was a young couple handing out

1 leaflets against the Medical School. I asked the
2 girl why was she against the Medical School, her
3 answer to me was because she was "Black". I said
4 to her "honey" is that your only reason? She said
5 yes, I said to her the one who gave you those
6 pamphlets should have told you what to say. I
7 told her whether they build a Medical School here
8 or not when its all over she'll still be "black".
9 Her partner across the street hearing this dis-
10 cussion came over and asked me why was I for the
11 Medical School. I said there would be jobs for
12 Negroes, and he stopped me at that point. He said
13 jobs what do you mean "The Broom". I said to him
14 yes, if thats all you are qualified for, you grab
15 the broom. I said there will be jobs for Secretary
16 Stenographers, File clerks, even up to the president.
17 A qualified Negro has a chance the opportunity for
18 a job, just last week. Another protestor came
19 along, a friend was standing talking to me in the
20 window, he pushed a phamplet into my friends hand
21 and started to push one in mine. I halted him and
22 asked him what it was. And he said we are against
23 the Medical School. I said don't put one in my hand
24 because I am for it.

25 He said you mean to tell me you are for a

1 medical school moving here from Alabama. At that point
2 me and my friend were suppose to get all excited at
3 his narrow-minned conclussions. As for the ones
4 crying for decent places to live more housing. I
5 think there are quite a few decent places available
6 with more being completed in the near future and more
7 in the planning stages now. Now that takes care of
8 decent places to live. What about the decent
9 tenants? To live in these apts. and to keep them
10 decent. They said they are not able to pay \$200.00
11 rent for these apts.

12 There are not too many people that are
13 employed that make less than \$500.00 a month. De-
14 ducting these \$150.00 a month spent at these tarvens
15 on weekends \$150.00 that they spend on cars that
16 they can't afford without this they can easily afford
17 to pay for a decent place to live. Our own City
18 Hospital is practically manned by foreign Doctors
19 and Interns. How about givine a few of our own boys
20 & girls a chance to learn medicine and dentistry in
21 our own schools because the citizens really need
22 them. I would like to know where were those pro-
23 testers when these firms were forced to move from
24 Newark, that employed thousands of Negros, and there
25 were no housing put up on these plots. Ronson
Lighter, I Lewis Cigar Factory, The Mannen Company,

1 Fischer Baking Company & lots of others.

2 This gentleman at 15 Wallace Street stated
3 that his house wasn't blighted inside or out side,
4 but just let him step out side and look around him.

5 Sincerely yours,

6 /s/ Edward McCray

7 EDWARD MC CRAY

8 Ph Ma 4-6188

9
10
11 60 Underwood St.,

12 Newark, N. J.

13 July 4, 1967

14 Dear Sir:

15 I wish to state that in my opinion there
16 should be no doubt as to whether the area for the
17 new medical college is blighted or not.

18 Anyone could drive up So. Orange Ave. as I
19 do daily and note the decrepit buildings and neigh-
20 borhood. There is no comparison between this area
21 and Vailsburg in which I live.

22 I know you had to have meetings to consol
23 the people that live there in the area to be demol-
24 ished but now that they are over I hope you will
25 reach a fast conclusion and speed the Med. site so

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

that there will be a reason to have "Pride in Newark".

Sincerely yours,
/s/ George F. Heim

26 Shanley Avenue
Newark, New Jersey
June 14, 1967

Mr. Alfred Booker, Chairman
Newark Central Planning Board
City Hall,
Newark, New Jersey

Dear Mr. Booker,

I am listed as a speaker at the hearing on the proposed Midical Center declaration. Because of the length of the hearings and the fact that I have to go out of town (the postmark on this envelope will testify to that), I shall be unable to appear in person to deliver my statement (enclosed).

I should appreciate the following: (1) When my turn is called, to permit someone to read my statement in my behalf. Such a person will very likely be in the audience at that time.

(2) Should that person be unable to be

1 present, to enter this statement (enclosed) into the
2 transcript of the hearing in its entirety in order
3 that my objections may be legally registered, as is
4 also the purpose of this letter.

5 Your kind attention will be appreciated.

6 Yours sincerely,

7 /s/ Stanley B. Winters

8 Stanley B. Winters.

9 STATEMENT OF STANELEY B. WINTERS

10 To be Presented to Newark Central Planning Board
11 on Hearing of Proposed Blight Declaration for
12 Medical College June]2, 1967.

13 My name is Stanley B. Winters and I
14 reside at 26 Shanley Avenue. I am a property
15 owner, that is a home owner, and taxpayer and
16 parent of a child in public school. I am also a
17 member of the Kenneth A. Gibson Civic Association.
18 There are many other things I could say about
19 myself as some of the housing officials who have
20 testified have done, but I do not think it would
21 add to the merit of what I have to say any more than
22 it added to their statements. In fact, I have been
23 attending and speaking at these blight hearings for
24 about ten years and I am weary with hearing over
25 and over again what some official did in 1954 or what

1 award he got in 1959, which we are told each time
2 at these hearings. The thing is that what happened
3 then is interesting in a curious and historical
4 way, but is no longer relevant. Today and tomorrow
5 are what is relevant. The battles of public
6 housing are long over with; the officials who fought
7 the real estate lobbies in the 1940's and early
8 1950's are today the same officials who enrich
9 these real estate interests by espousing policies
10 which aggravate the shortage of decent rental
11 housing in our city and by placing enormous tracts
12 of land acquired with public funds at the disposal
13 of private speculative interests. So I hope that
14 at any future hearings the audience's time will be
15 saved by not repeating these stale recitations of
16 alleged public service above and beyond the call
17 of duty.

18 In addressing myself to the matter of
19 whether this area in question is truly a so-called
20 blighted area, I wish first to say that in my
21 judgment this Board is unqualified to conduct this
22 hearing and should withdraw from further proceed-
23 ings. First, certain Board members have lent their
24 opinions to a newspaper article of May 11, 1967
25 (Newark News) indicating that the area in question

1 is "terrible", thereby prejudging the case.

2 Second, the Board is appointed by the Mayor, and

3 he has been the prime visible supporter of this

4 project. It would therefore be awkward if not

5 virtually impossible for any Board member --

6 having been appointed by the Mayor -- to vote

7 against the project. In this sense the verdict of

8 this Board is predetermined. Third, the record of

9 the Central Planning Board in Newark since the new

10 City Charter came in in 1953 indicates it is

11 neither representative of nor responsive to the

12 citizenry of Newark, notably those from the resi-

13 dential neighborhoods who make up the city's

14 tenants, homeowners, and taxpaying population.

15 There is no case where the Board has ever refused

16 to declare blighted any area presented to it by

17 the Housing and Redevelopment Agency. If there has

18 ever even been one dissenting vote, that has not

19 been made public. The Board in effect is a rubber

20 stamp some of whose members have nothing in their

21 backgrounds to especially qualify them for this

22 position. Fourth, the present membership of the

23 Board is unrepresentative of the ethnic and

24 economic composition of the people of the city.

25 Today Newark is largely a city of poor and low

1 income black and Puerto Rican people, yet where
2 or any poor or black or Puerto Ricans on this
3 board and who live in Newark? This is a hearing
4 not before our peers but before a select and un-
5 representative group, and I might say that after
6 an analysis of the personnel sitting on other such
7 bodies like the Housing Authority and the NCNCR,
8 the same criticism hold true. Citizen participation
9 in Newark in the process of urban-renewal is a
10 mockery of that concept. A small minority of
11 time-worn hacks at least one of whom - - not on
12 this body - - got his position back in 1950 when
13 this was a totally different city, persist in
14 making the vital decisions about the lives and
15 homes of thousands of people with whom they have
16 nothing in common so far as outlook, income, race
17 or occupation is concerned. Fifth, this hearing
18 itself is in my judgment illegal because it begins
19 afresh while ignoring the testimony set forth at
20 the previous hearing three weeks ago which was, in
21 the words of this Board's chairman, "Adjourned '
22 indefinitely." Accordint to New Jersey R.S. 40:55
23 21.6, on the conduct of these hearings, it is
24 stated, "At the hearing, which may be adjourned
25 from time to time..." a hearing must be reconvened

1 after adjournment. By ignoring the first hearing
2 and in effect wiping it out the Board has violated
3 the rights of witnesses heard then yet mentally
4 will be influenced in its decision at the end of
5 this second hearing by the events and testimony of
6 the first. Sixth, this hearing is predetermined
7 because the governing body and Mayor of this city
8 have already entered into binding commitments and
9 contracts about this project - - that the governing
10 body is already obligated to support a finding of
11 blight in order to fulfill its contractual obli-
12 gations - - that an extensive public relations
13 and psychological campaign has been waged in behalf
14 of this project, and therefore the outcome is
15 assured. I therefore urge you as individuals and
16 as a group to disqualify yourselves from further
17 proceedings and to withdraw from this case or
18 resign from the Board.

19 Proper consideration of this proposal must
20 take into account its origin and subsequent develop-
21 ment. The city's Master Plan, updated and approved
22 after various hearings in 1964-65 reveals not the
23 slightest indication of any sort of redevelopment
24 in this area related to medical usage except some
25 expansion for City Hospital. The rest is to remain

1 the same or see new housing and new recreational
2 facilities. In fact, on the very site where the
3 "first stage" of this medical center is proposed
4 the Master Plan (p. 63) recommends a 10-acre play-
5 ground and a neighborhood park to service the Newton
6 Street and Robert Treat School districts. The
7 adjoining Fairmount Renewal Project is described
8 (p.64) as including possible expansion of City
9 Hospital but not for a medical college and center.
10 The Master Plan's section on Health facilities
11 (pp. 88-90 also makes no such references; yet it
12 does indicate a future for the area as a community
13 of residents. The extensive Re-New Newark Report
14 of 1961 describes this area, in part, as follows
15 (p. 85): "There is a possibility that this area
16 with private rehabilitation and strict code enforce-
17 ment may be able to improve itself... Because of
18 the serious shortage of recreation space, provisions
19 for play facilities should be made immediately but
20 in conformity with the eventual renewal proposals
21 ... There are, however, a number of blocks in
22 which rehabilitation treatment would be effective
23 in this area." Finally, the Re-New Newark Report
24 urges ultimate redevelopment of the area for "pre-
25 dominant residential development of medium density.."

Pages 14+15 missing

1 Now both these reports, prepared after
2 extensive study by experts hired by this very Board,
3 indicate that the area today you are asked to de-
4 clare blighted for total clearance had a future as a
5 community for the people of the city. The findings
6 of these reports contract with the testimony of the
7 officials here and bring home a powerful lesson.
8 One cannot talk about how "terrible" things are,
9 as some of you gentlemen did in the press article
10 cited above, without also pinpointing the official
11 neglect and inefficiency which prevented any follow-
12 up to these recommendations and instead allowed
13 the neighborhood to drift and stagnate. Then along
14 come the Mayor, the Housing Authority, and others
15 who are suddenly interested in the area's future
16 where before they were not - - and they say, look
17 at these vacant lots, the rusty cars, the broken
18 down buildings - isn't it terrible? Do you gentlemen
19 realize how much of this sort of thing has actually
20 occurred within the past eight months since the
21 Medical College proposal was pushed by the Mayor?
22 I drive through this area every day, twice a day;
23 I have friends in this area and visit their homes.
24 There has been a significant change in the quality
25 of the upkeep of the area recently. Landlords and

1 tenants alike apparently feel a sense of inevitabil-
2 ity about the destruction of their homes and small
3 businessmen too. The manner by which public
4 officials foster this sense of inevitability
5 through reckless, unequivocal, and premature press
6 releases and authoritarian methods of proceeding
7 borders on open irresponsibility. These are the
8 real culprits, and others involved behind the scenes,
9 but they are not the ones who suffer; only the people
10 in the community suffer. We saw the same thing
11 happen in the original 250-acre site of NJ R-32,
12 the so-called Light Industrial Project. If people
13 in Clinton Hill hadn't fought that tooth and nail
14 and in the courts, 5,000 dwelling units and 18,000
15 people would have been bulldozed without any plan
16 for replacement of their living quarters. I may
17 insert here the comment that, with all respect to
18 Mr. George Richardson, who spoke earlier, and with
19 whose views on this project I generally agree, I
20 take exception to his remark that the "litigation
21 in R-32 was fought by members of the Negro community
22 ...". It was fought, and the record shows, by members
23 of the Negro and of the white community, and this
24 unity of purpose was a source of strength in the
25 fight.

1 And now, having learned nothing from that
2 struggle, the officials and other interests want
3 to do the same thing in this project. They ignore
4 the fact that the city has strained its credit to
5 the limit, has levelled prematurely enormous tracts
6 with disastrous impact upon the tax rate - - having
7 been seduced by the siren song of supposedly cutting
8 social costs, reducing public school enrollments,
9 lowering welfare rolls, to bring in new business,
10 industry and public institutions. In limited
11 amounts this approach may have value, if done with
12 community participation and timed over many years;
13 in the wholesale manner contemplated here, great
14 shocks result in the social fabric. These very
15 hearings are evidence of that. Defiance of govern-
16 ment and of institutions is the result. Just before
17 the first hearing - the one that was "adjourned
18 indefinitely" - the press reported that about 35
19 acres of the Fairmount Renewal Area will not be
20 included in the medical site, thereby "relieving the
21 housing authority of an immediate problem" - what to
22 do with that land... there were nearly 27 acres
23 without a sponsor or plans for redevelopment."
24 Thats a quotation. Isn't this so typical of the
25 operations of this authority, which has placed before

1 you this blight declaration? Rank speculation with
2 the lives and property of others, flim flam planning,
3 open improvisation, hoping for a miracle - and here
4 it is - the medical center. And we are supposed
5 to swallow that in the name of "progress."

6 One of my objections to this proposed
7 declaration of blight is that it would result in
8 an unjust taking of property - or to phrase this as
9 a question: Where a state statute both/establishes
10 a procedure for a blight declaration and requires
11 the municipality to acquire the property so
12 declared blighted, does the declaration of blight
13 constitute a "deprivation" of property in the
14 constitutional sense of Article XIV, Section 1 of
15 the United States Constitution so as to require a
16 trial type hearing? This hearing is quasi-
17 legislative and lacks the protections of judicial
18 process. Yet if you declare the area blighted,
19 the value of every property in the area will imme-
20 diately drop - in fact has already dropped because
21 of the publicity and sense of inevitability I men-
22 tioned above. Conditions will further deteriorate
23 as inevitable delays occur. I therefore challenge
24 the validity of this hearing as an unfair taking
25 of property. The experience of other projects is a

1 guide. Take R-38, the so-called Clinton Hill
2 Rehabilitation Project, placed in the jurisdiction
3 of the Housing Authority four years ago. Yet not
4 a single new structure erected despite the 11 years
5 duration of this project. Empty lots, garbage dumps
6 your so-called experts come along and say, "Terrible."
7 "Let's tear down 20 per cent instead of the
8 originally planned 10, or 30 per cent instead of
9 20. Values of the remaining houses are also affect-
10 ed. Then in comes the Fire Commissioner and calls
11 the place a fire-trap, so many fire alarms, and so
12 forth. The service of the Fire Department is well
13 known and deservedly so, but what are they doing to
14 prevent fires, not merely put them out? Why aren't
15 unsafe conditions called to the owner's attention
16 by their Bureau of Combustibles? Almost every
17 recent fire carries with it a report of "suspicious
18 origin". What is being done to apprehend those
19 responsible? The Housing Authority also is impli-
20 cated in this failure to prevent rather than to
21 patch up or clear away after the damage is done.
22 Under New Jersey R.S. 55:14A-52, "In addition to
23 surveys and plans which an authority is otherwise
24 authorized to make, an authority is hereby specifi-
25 cally authorized to make (i) plans for carrying out

1 a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation
2 of buildings and improvements, and (ii) plans for
3 enforcement of laws, codes, and regulations relating
4 to the use of land and the use and occupancy of
5 buildings and improvements, and to the compulsory
6 repair, rehabilitation, demolition, or removal of
7 buildings and improvements. The authority is auth-
8 orized to develop, test, and report methods and
9 techniques, and carry out demonstrations and other
10 activities for the prevention and the elimination of
11 blight." Yet the Newark Authority has almost ex-
12 clusively concentrated on only one aspect of this
13 comprehensive authorization - namely, "demolition,
14 or removal..." rather than prevention. It too
15 bears a heavy share of responsibility for our city's
16 failure to resolve its slum problem.

17 It is reported in the N.Y. Times that the
18 city of Newark has received \$277.33 per inhabitant
19 for urban renewal, the second highest total in the
20 entire country. Would you believe it from the
21 results? Large vacant lots with carnivals on them,
22 declining tax rates, all manner of concessions
23 to real estate speculators, a vast patronage bureau-
24 cracy infected with nepotism. The Mayor is impelled
25 to call in an outside agency to check on our urban

renewal procedures. What took him so long? Didn't he criticize those same procedures when he first ran for office in 1962? Those procedures have not changed one bit since then. He was reportedly concerned about questions that have been raised about the City's relocation and other methods. It took 45 citizens last spring petitioning the Regional Office of Urban Renewal to suspend the city's Workable Program to get that result. And that program, whose recertification was announced in the press - - but not the challenge to it by the 45 citizens - was suddenly recertified by the Federal officials in the midst of negotiations for a hearing between the officials and the citizens. Why so suddenly? Wherever one turns, one finds the cards stacked against citizen involvement and participation despite the lofty phrases.

Take the matter of relocation, which the Housing Authority officials assure us will take place smoothly and equitably. Mr. Warrence is quoted in the June 11 Newark News as claiming a vacancy rate of 4.4 per cent or 6,000 apartments a year in Newark's privately owned housing. But at what rentals, Mr. Warrence? Low or high? Listen to what the Federal Housing Administration had to

say in its "Analysis of the Newark New Jersey
Housing Market," issued October, 1965 (p. 20):

"In the City of Newark there are 2,275 vacant units
available for sale or rent at present, a net vacancy
ratio of 1.9 per cent. This is about 3,000 vacant
units fewer than in 1960... The large scale demoli-
tion of housing units since 1960 and the attendant
absorption of old, low-rent units in the city, by
families displaced by demolition, together with a
decline in the housing stock of the city, are re-
flected in the tightened market." We have here a
manifest contradiction. One and a half years after
the FHA found a vacancy rate of 1.9 per cent, Mr.
Warrence finds a rate 250 per cent higher. FHA found
2,575 vacancies, the Housing Authority 6,000. The
authority claims a turnover rate of 1,300 families
a year in public housing. How many are merely moving
from one project to another? How long are the
waiting lists in existing projects? Will someone
tell us. One June 10 the Newark News reports the
fire department as saying that 1,000 families in 500
homes are evicted every year by fire in the city.
Where do these people go? Have they been included
in anyone's calculations? Isn't also the 221D3 re-
location housing program going to be useless for

low-income families in Newark now that Congress has refused to increase rent supplements? Rent supplement programs will merely be stabilized in communities which already have them, and since Newark doesn't, how will the poor be able to afford middle-income housing, even were it to exist in the quantity claimed? Despite all the rhetoric, the people of this area in question today will be scattered to the winds like their predecessors with only a few actually achieving the legal requirement of "decent, safe, and sanitary housing" at comparable rentals and with no major inconvenience in location. For this reason alone this proposal should be rejected by you.

This declaration and its implementation will also aggravate school overcrowding. The report of Dr. VanNess, assistant superintendent of schools for elementary education, issued in May, 1967, warns that next fall the overutilization of available pupil stations in Newark public schools will rise from 107 to a high of 115 per cent. This will mean more half-day sessions, such as the one my daughter is now on. There are hundreds of school-age children in this site. Where will they go? Most of the people displaced will stay in

1 Newark (only 1 Negro family in 20 has moved out of
2 the city after urban renewal displacement since 1960)
3 and enroll in other schools, aggravating both the
4 index of racial segregation and of overcrowding.
5 Take the typical case of the Belmont-Runyon "tem-
6 porary" school, a brainstorm of the new Superin-
7 tendent of Schools back in 1961, in response to
8 community pressure for more classroom space yet a
9 refusal to face the fact that the scheme of the
10 Housing Authority to demolish R-32 would not go
11 through. That school was designed for 950 children.
12 It opened in the winter of 1962 with 1,050 children
13 and went up steadily. For the past three years
14 up to 300 children have been bused daily to other
15 schools to relieve the overcrowding. How long
16 will this type of Russian Roulette with the educa-
17 tion of our children go on? I maintain that a
18 taxpayer whose child is on a four-hour day because
19 of this procedure, while other children in the city
20 and in other communities are on seven-hour days,
21 is being denied equal protection of the laws and
22 an equal return for his tax funds, and this is
23 being unjustly deprived of his property. I there-
24 fore object to this plan on these grounds.

25 The real purpose of this project was

1 disclosed by the Star Ledger last March in an
2 article which said that this project is vital to
3 Newark because the city "is in desperate need of an
4 economic shot in the arm." Yes, Newark needs a shot
5 in the arm - who will administer the serum, what
6 kind of serum will it be, and who will receive it?
7 The site residents? The displaced? The ordinary
8 citizens? Or others?

9 This is not the place to argue the merits
10 or demerits of the actually proposed Medical Center
11 despite all the planted and well-timed articles
12 that just happen to appear the day before these
13 hearings take place. Such a vast proposal has to
14 have good and bad points. But at least let us not
15 pass it off as an unmixed blessing for Newark and
16 for the majority of its people. The directors of
17 this Center have not even gone on record yet to
18 commit themselves to a program of community medical
19 service to the city. Why therefore should we believe
20 that the record of this Center in Newark will be
21 any different than it was in Jersey City, than NYU
22 was in Bellevue, or of Bronx Community Hospital?

23 Now you gentlemen are allegedly going to
24 make your decision on the basis of all the evidence
25 presented to you, not just visual impressions of the

1 site. That means reading the transcript of this
2 hearing. That means checking out the surveys made
3 by the Housing Authority officials, their facts
4 and figures. That means consulting your planning
5 staff. All this takes time. We also want the
6 right to inspect all evidence presented to you. We
7 want a time and place designated when this can be
8 done so we can rebut before your final decision is
9 rendered. All this will take time. If your
10 decision should be rendered within one or two weeks
11 after the last session of this hearing, then we can
12 only conclude that you did not fully and fairly
13 review the testimony and evidence and did not give
14 objectors a chance to inspect the evidence. We
15 assume the transcript will be typed and in your
16 hands also, and available for public inspection - -
17 all this will also have to be made available to the
18 City Council. We are here talking about for and
19 five weeks. Maybe more. Can you enlighten us on
20 that point?

21 In conclusion, I urge the following (1)
22 that you disqualify yourselves from this proceeding;
23 (2) failing that, to reject the declaration of
24 blight for the reasons cited; (3) failing that, to
25 present a comprehensive statement dealing with the

1 various arguments and justifying any other alterna-
2 tive decision. I would like to commend the chairman
3 of this Board for permitting one speaker from the
4 objectors to testify after one official, alternating
5 instead of the old practice of hearing all of the
6 officials first until everyone was either asleep
7 or exhausted from waiting his turn. This is a
8 small progressive improvement. It comes only six
9 years after the hearing on R-32, the Light Industrial
10 where objectors once and for all exposed the phony
11 five-minute time limit imposed on speakers by the
12 previous chairman in violation of their basic
13 rights. Six years between improvements - that is
14 progress, gentlemen. Thank you.

15
16
17 -----
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25